DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 440 068 SP 039 108

AUTHOR Snell, Jean L.

TITLE The Liminal Tension of Performance Evaluation for Preservice Teacher Educators: A Mechanism for Accountability or a Tool for Growth?

PUB DATE 2000-02-29

NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (52nd, Chicago, IL, February 26-29, 2000).

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Accountability; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Feedback; Higher Education; *Performance Based Assessment; Preservice Teacher Education; Teacher Competencies; *Teacher Educators; *Teacher Evaluation; Teaching Assistants

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the complexities surrounding teacher evaluation in general, and the evaluation of preservice teacher educators affiliated with a university teacher education program in particular. It focuses on the purposes of evaluation, whether those purposes are complementary or in conflict with one another, how the evaluation is related to reflection, and how the actual act of evaluation is negotiated between teachers and supervisors. The paper begins by relating the story of one particularly troubling evaluation incident. Next, it examines the context of evaluation, viewing teacher evaluation as a professional challenge and discussing the shift from K-12 teacher evaluation to preservice teacher educator evaluation. Finally, the paper describes a pilot evaluation process for teaching assistants in one teacher education program, highlighting the goal-setting, evaluation process, and re-assessment phases of the effort. This pilot process puts teaching assistant preservice teacher educators in charge of the design and implementation of their own evaluation through a reflective portfolio process. This promotes a sense of professionalism and competence and creates a mutually supportive community of self-confident preservice teacher educators. (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 440 068

The Liminal Tension of Performance Evaluation for Preservice Teacher Educators: A Mechanism for Accountability or a Tool for Growth?

Jean L. Snell
email: snelljl@u.washington.edu
The University of Washington
AACTE Annual Meeting: Chicago, IL
"Performance Standards for Teaching Assistants in Education: Assessing and Nurturing Preservice Teacher Educators"
February 29, 2000

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. L. Snell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP039108

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Liminal Tension of Performance Evaluation for Preservice Teacher Educators: A Mechanism for Accountability or a Tool for Growth?

Introduction

Most of us can close our eyes and recall an encounter with a professional evaluation incident in which our feelings, egos, and sometimes even formal employment records were damaged. We might have slunk through such an evaluation protocol by trying to solicit as little attention and notice as possible. Perhaps we felt ourselves pitted against our supervisors in such an encounter, in which we were suddenly on trial in front of a two-faced judge. Or, we might have despaired at how demoralizing the process was in its treatment of us as pawns of some game for which we did not get to make the rules.

In this paper, I begin with a personal story in which I recount a troubling evaluation incident that has stayed with me for years. This story serves as a lead-in to my exploration of the complexities surrounding teacher evaluation, in general, and the evaluation of preservice teacher educators affiliated with a university teacher education program, in particular. I will be examining the following questions through this exploration: What are the purposes of evaluation? Are these purposes complimentary or in conflict with one another? How is evaluation related to reflection? And how is the actual act of evaluation negotiated between teachers and supervisors? In the final section of the paper, I will present a pilot goal-setting and evaluation program which was implemented this year for teaching assistants with the teacher education program at the University of Washington.

Prologue

In my first year as a new high school teacher, in addition to being paired with a mentor teacher who joined me in my classroom at least twice a month, I was also regularly visited by the Dean of Faculty, my Department Chair, and the Principal. All of these colleagues coached and supported me through the process of becoming a co-professional, and each of them contributed to my first formal end-of-the-year evaluation. In the years following my apprenticeship, however, my classroom was visited less and less, and the evaluation process to which all of us was subject seemed mostly artificial and irrelevant. Evaluation in these early years appeared to me to be a task that had to be performed by the principal as yet one more item to check off of his long list of

duties.

However, in my fifth year as a secondary teacher, a revamped evaluation process was introduced at the school. Under the new regime, an evaluating supervisor was to observe each of our classrooms once a quarter, guided by a pre- and post-observation protocol, and following these visits the supervisor was to record their observations through a written description that was shared with us. At the end of the year, each supervisor was responsible for drafting a formal evaluation which reflected the conversations and observations generated throughout the year. I welcomed the news of this new policy, for I welcomed the prospect of once again participating in a meaningful evaluation process, and I hoped I could use my interactions with an evaluating supervisor as a catalyst for my own growth and development as an teacher.

So it was with a calm stomach that I entered my principal's office that fall to follow up with his first classroom observation of me under the school's new protocol. Simon[1] had observed a lesson on the pre-writing stage of the research process in which students brainstormed topics for their research papers and practiced a webbing technique to help them gather their ideas. At the bell, when he and the students filed out of the classroom he smiled at me and said, "nice lesson." As my former department chair and later as the interim principal, I was accustomed to working with him as one of my official supervisors; and, as a exemplary English teacher and the coach of our state-championship boys varsity soccer team, I looked to him as a role model who could teach me plenty about my craft. Thus, when I sat down in the chair across from him at his desk, I did not expect the first words out of his mouth to be words of concern about my overall relationship with the students at the school. He led by saying that he had noticed some tension between me and a group of senior boys who had reported to him that they had had a "run-in" with me. Dizzy in my seat, I frantically searched in my mind to remember the incident to which Simon was referring -- "what run-in, with what boys, and what about what he observed in my sophomore research writing class?" He continued with his monologue, his voice growing dim to my ears as he droned on about the importance of respect and how students best learn self respect and how to respect others from the modeling behavior of adults. "What about respect for me, respect for the evaluation protocol," I squirmed?

After finishing his testimonial on respect, Simon cleared his throat and shifted the gears of

[1] Names have been changed for purposes of confidentiality

the conversation to what I thought was supposed to be the matter at hand -- his recent observation of my teaching. He then thanked me for the enjoyable class, reporting that he had witnessed a well-structured lesson and that it was clear to him that my teaching was becoming more student centered, and he complimented me on my ability to engage students on a topic that is not normally considered by most to be very scintillating. He concluded by stating that "it is clear that you have done a nice job of organizing a curriculum for a writing course that is clear and challenging, and that the students enjoyed completing the tasks you set before them."

How was I supposed to respond to his mixed commentary? While I was pleased that Simon had acknowledged my growth with the sophomore research writing class, I was, nevertheless, stunned by his opening remarks. How could he praise me for my effectiveness in one arena, and chastise me for my deficiencies in another? And if he saw me treating my sophomores with respect in the course of the fifty-five minute period that he observed, then what kind of disrespect was he associating with me and some other crop of students? I finally managed to produce a question for him, "what boys are you referring to, and what do you mean I need to work on building relationships with some of the upper classman?" At this point in the post-observation conference, Simon explained that it was because he knew that I was a teacher who generally treated students with respect that he wanted to call my attention to the complaints of this small cadre of students. He asked if I had any further questions, and, on that note, since my only clear thought was of escape, I accepted his exit cue and excused myself to go prepare for my next class.

I have thought about this short but excruciating conference many times since that Autumn morning many years ago. It is no surprise, perhaps, that in the end my formal evaluation from Simon was positive, without any reference to these mysterious senior boys. In reflecting upon his admonishment, I realized that there was, indeed, a clique of senior boys that year for whom I did have little patience, most of whom were starters on the varsity soccer team. I had none of these boys in my classes, so my interaction with them was limited to the lunchroom, the hallways, and an occasional class meeting. In retrospect, I have come to assume that the "run-in" to which he was referring was in regards to a series of confrontations that I had had with several of his boys concerning their senior pages in the yearbook. As the advisor to the yearbook staff, I had the formidable task of editing all of the seniors' text to meet the prescribed guidelines. Not pleased

that their self-expression was curtailed by my red pen, I reminded several of these young men that the yearbook was a public document which represented the entire school and not just their private memories. This was the same clique of senior boys, Simon failed to mention, who vandalized the school over Homecoming weekend with spray paint and a few "accidental" broken windows.

What has lingered with me over the years with regards to this incident is not, however, remembering my frustration towards a particular crop of senior boys, but my frustration over the fact that the potential fruit of this evaluation process was lost. Derailed by personal politics, my interactions with Simon that year never served as fodder for my own reflection and growth. Instead, he went through the motions and I followed him, not trusting him to be as invested in my professional development as he was in protecting the reputation of his soccer boys. In theory, by allowing us to discuss our pedagogical goals with our supervisors and then to gauge our individual progress in meeting these goals through this dialogue, we were supposedly being given the opportunity to participate in a process that was enlivening. However, in my interactions with Simon that year, despite the soundness of the design, the revamped evaluation process served as an instrument of defeat rather than an instrument of growth. Thus, in the early years of my teaching career I learned that evaluation is a part of a professional life that is to be endured. Like many veteran teachers, I "learned my lesson" that evaluation can be a painful experience.

The Context

Teacher Evaluation: A Professional Challenge

In both my personal experience and in the research, formal performance evaluation emerges as a charged issue for K-12 educators. Often engendering mistrust between teachers and their supervisors, the explicit purposes of evaluation, i.e. assessment of teacher competence, seem to clash with the implicit purposes of evaluation, i.e. the professional development of teachers. In this section of the paper, I will be exploring what the inherent challenges are in transforming formal evaluation practices into empowering experiences for teachers and administrators alike.

The complexities embedded in this issue emerge clearly from reviewing the research literature on this subject. Researchers have documented that it is regularly not clear whether the primary purpose of evaluation is the monitoring and appraisal of teacher performance around a

defined and often standardized set of competencies, or whether the primary purpose of evaluation is to foster the growth and improvement of teaching and learning. Simon Gleave asserts that the problem with teacher evaluation is that it requires "bi-focal" vision on the part of evaluators who simultaneously must assess the performance of teachers and encourage their development (1997). By reminding us of the seemingly antithetical purposes of evaluation, this researcher exposes the fundamental paradox of this phenomenon - - for evaluative cannot function simultaneously as a mechanism of growth and a mechanism of accountability.

Penelope Peterson and Michelle Comeaux (1990) report that when evaluation is imposed upon teachers and sanctions are attached to poor performance ratings, then they are dis-empowered as professionals and as advocates for children. However, when evaluation functions as a catalyst for reflection, when it creates an opportunity for dialogue between teachers and their supervisors about what constitutes quality teaching and quality learning, then evaluation serves as a tool of empowerment and improvement. Daniel Duke (1990) contends that while it is important for teachers to demonstrate their proficiency in the basics of pedagogy, assessment, classroom management, and content-knowledge, proficiency which is made evident through formal evaluation, he also asserts that professional growth and development should be the overriding goal of evaluation for "teachers who are already competent." He continues, "Growth and development connote learning that leads beyond minimum or basic competence to new levels of understanding and mastery, a fresh sense of professional purpose and capabilities, or a more sophisticated awareness of the context in which one works" (p. 131). Recognizing that adults, in general, are motivated by the opportunity to grow, he encourages educators to reconsider the powerful possibilities for re-conceptualized and re-tooled evaluation practices.

Concerned that K-12 teachers, overall, do not have adequate access to evaluation opportunities, Gary Natriello (1984) documents how even as the pressure has increased on teachers for greater accountability on student outcomes, the frequency of evaluation of teachers remains low. While he, like his colleagues, recognizes that evaluation can be utilized as an attempted "means of achieving greater control over the educational processes" (p. 580), he strongly recommends increasing the frequency of evaluation in order to use it, instead, as a tool to increase teacher effectiveness. In total, these researchers advocate for a reform of traditional evaluation processes, to shift the emphasis from the mere assessment of basic competencies to the

empowerment of teachers' growth. For they all concur that the greatest obstacles to an empowering teacher evaluation process "lie(s) in the attitudes of teachers and administrators about each other . . and about the [mixed] purposes of evaluation" (qtd. by McLaughlin and Pfeifer; Peterson and Comeaux, p. 7).

In order to facilitate the growth of teachers, these researchers document the kinds of practices that an effective evaluation process must contain. Peterson and Comeaux (1990) emphasize that evaluation occurs in both a school and individual context, whereby the needs of both are best served by "tailoring teacher evaluation systems to serve different [individual] needs" (p. 23). Agreeing with his colleagues that any effective evaluation process must be an individualized rather than one-size-fits-all process, Duke (1990) contends that "the implication for teacher evaluation is clear -- systems that encourage growth should be sufficiently *flexible* to accommodate teachers" (p. 133). He recommends that the evaluation process be separated into several distinct and, perhaps, "parallel" systems: an "accountability" system for newer, non-tenured teachers, an "assistance" system for struggling tenured teachers, and a "professional development system driven by individual growth goals" (p. 136). Thus, in this multi-systems approach, evaluation is not something that is "done" to the majority of teachers, but is, instead, a process in which teachers themselves are engaged and put at the center. In this active role, they participate in formal goal-setting and in strategizing how to foster their growth in the targeted areas with their supervisors. This researchers report, too, that evaluation can be a "growth-oriented" process only if teachers ultimately "feel safe to experiment." He concludes that "it is far more desirable to encourage [capable teachers] to stretch professionally and risk not completely accomplishing their goals than to induce a cautious approach to growth by attaching sanctions to failure [to meet ones' individual goals]" (p. 137).

Thus, for evaluation to serve as a productive experience for teachers rather than a counterproductive one, these researchers demonstrate that growth oriented evaluation systems must involve teachers as the authors of their own directed development, must provide support and assistance to them in both developing their professional goals and in acquiring new skills which are implicated in their targeted goal areas, and must ultimately cultivate trust between teachers and supervisors. They document, too, how hungry teachers are for an evaluation process which fosters their growth, and how weary they are of the usual, alienating evaluation fare. Therefore,

the research reveals that growth oriented evaluation rests upon opening up honest and on-going reflective dialogue between teachers and their supervisors about what fosters student learning and thereby about what constitutes good teaching.

A New Frontier: A Shift From K-12 Teacher Evaluation to Preservice Teacher Educator Evaluation

While the K-12 educational system today is beset by pressures to raise standards in order to raise student test scores, and therefore the performance of schools, principals, and teachers are increasingly scrutinized by the public in an attempt to impose some measures of accountability, state legislators are also increasingly bringing this "bottom-line" mentality into their interactions with public university personnel. For those positioned as university professors, there is a long-standing tradition of tenure which governs all evaluation, promotion, and non-promotion processes. While the complexities of the tenure-granting process are, indeed, a rich subject for research, in this paper I am interested, instead, in exploring the connections between the issues surrounding evaluation for K-12 teachers and the issues surrounding evaluation for university teaching assistants who are not included in the tenure system. In particular, I am interested in examining the challenges of creating and implementing an evaluation system which serves as an opportunity for the growth and nurturing of teaching assistants who are affiliated with a Teacher Education Program (TEP). At the University of Washington, the evaluation of all university teaching assistants is guided, in part, by the formal bylaws of the university and, in part,by the specific protocols of each academic department.

All University of Washington graduate teaching assistants are protected under an Executive Order which outlines the procedures for appointment, training, promotion, and termination. Decreeing that "close supervision of new teachers" by each department is "expected," the University of Washington dictates that "because of the importance of graduate student appointments as training in teaching and research it is appropriate for regular evaluation of performance to be made, analogous to the evaluation of academic performance in courses." Thus, in Executive Order #28 it formally stipulates that:

"Each department will be responsible for implementing a program of evaluation to be conducted at least annually. Evaluation of the quality of teaching done by a graduate student

appointee may be based on those procedures developed within the department but should include evaluation by the professor responsible for the course based on at least two visits to the appointee's class or on methods previously agreed to by both parties. Evaluations of the student appointee's performance should be placed on file, available for review by the student and by the departmental chairperson."

According to this executive order, evaluation is portrayed as a mechanism of re-appointment. The university bylaws state that "students who perform meritoriously in their graduate programs and in their teaching, research, and related activities may normally expect to be promoted in the course of their service." As stated, teaching assistants who perform their duties "meritoriously" will be retained, and "in the event that, in the opinion of the department chair or other faculty or staff supervisor the student is performing unsatisfactorily in the appointment, the appointment may be terminated at any time." What these formal policies do not highlight, however, is that the fact that for teaching assistants who are implicated in this evaluation system, jobs, tuition waivers, health benefits, and access to higher education are at stake. A satisfactory evaluation means reappointment and/or promotion; an unsatisfactory evaluation means termination. And yet how an individual teaching assistant and their supervisor negotiate the process of assessing the adequacy of their performance is not identified through any formal university-wide statute. Instead, Executive Order #28 indicates that in each department, "an appropriate degree of supervision will be worked out between the teaching appointees and the professors."

Working out an appropriate and satisfactory evaluatory relationship between teaching assistants and their supervisors is complicated in the Teacher Education department (TEP) at the University of Washington by virtue of the multiple roles that all TEP TAs play. First, TEP TAs serve as instructional assistants for professors who teach the core coursework in the TEP program. In this role, TAs often grade student work, lead discussion sections, meet individually with students during office hours, and work collaboratively with professors to plan and execute their courses. Second, TEP TAs serve as reflective leaders, either as the facilitator of a weekly reflective seminar with a group of TEP students or as the portfolio mentor for TEP students who are in their last quarter of the program. In both cases, "the TA is expected to teach TEP students about the nature of reflective practice, engage them in actual reflection about issues in teaching, and prepare them to engage in reflective writing" (Adriance & Jay, 2000). And finally, TEP TAs

become members of a professional community through their participation in a weekly TA seminar. Because TEP TAs concurrently assist a professor, serve the students directly, and have responsibilities as members of a professional, collegial community, it does is not readily apparent who, exactly, should serve in a supervisory capacity in overseeing the performance of TAs in these multiple roles. And because TEP TAs serve multiple constituents at once, thus clouding the issue of supervision, designing a comprehensive evaluation system through which it is possible to assess a TA in these multiple roles has been a challenge. After all, who should serve as the supervising evaluator of a TEP TA? How should the various constituents who a preservice teacher educator serves be involved and included in a formal evaluation process? And by what standards should the adequacy of a TEP teaching assistant's performance be assessed?

Clearly, many of the same issues which emerge from the research on K-12 teacher evaluation with regards to how teachers and supervisors actually negotiate the process of evaluation have also emerged for us as issues regarding the evaluation of university teaching assistants, and yet there seems to be a paucity of current research available on the challenges embedded in the evaluation of this population. There is also no research available on the evaluation of university teaching assistants who are employed by a teacher education program, who, for the most part, bring to this role significant teaching experience. Unlike the challenge for most university departments who must utilize teaching assistants with no previous teaching experience, the TEP TAs at the University Washington have significant pedagogical expertise. Therefore, with this pool of individuals, if an evaluation process is only targeted at assessing basic instructional competence then a rare opportunity is lost. For the TEP TAs at the University of Washington are, by and large, not only competent teachers but excellent ones. So while the importance of teachers demonstrating their basic competence is undisputable, either in the university or K-12 setting, assessing mere competence is too modest a goal for an evaluation system which attends to already proficient teachers. The Assistant Director of the Teacher Education program at the University of Washington explains;

"TAs are, in essence, preservice teacher educators: while they may be experienced and skilled in teaching, learning, and assessment in the context of K-12 settings, they are usually inexperienced in teaching adults who aspire to become teachers. Yet the three aspects for their day-to-day work for TEP requires that they be able to immediately and successfully apply concepts of

best practice to their professional development of their soon-to-be certified charges. It is clear that there is a logical connection between the TAs' need for mastery of the skills of best practice, with TEP's need to assess and support their transfer of teaching skills to this new context. The success of the TEP program is largely dependent on effective TAs, so ongoing assessment of TAs in all these roles is critical" (McKenna, 2000; p. 2).

Like many of our public school colleagues, we have struggled in the TEP program at the University of Washington to recast the evaluation process towards professional growth and development and away from strict supervision. As we have wrestled with how much of the evaluation process to devote to assessing the job performance competence of a TEP TA and how to much to devote to encouraging their professional growth, we have begun experimenting with what a growth oriented evaluation model for TEP TAs might look like in which TAs are, in large part, authors of their own directed growth, in which support, guidance, and assistance are provided to individuals in developing their professional goals and in learning new skills, and in which a reflective dialogue between TAs and their supervisors is initiated. It has been our guiding hope that we could create an formal evaluation process which empowers the teaching assistants in the Teacher Education Program at the University of Washington towards becoming teacher educators. McKenna (2000) reports; "TEP TAs have two major challenges. First, they must prepare themselves to effectively enter and prosper in higher education as teacher educators, scholars, and researchers. Second, they must immediately apply the skills of teacher educator in their role as mentor to the TEP masters students" (p. 10). Therefore, we designed a pilot program which caters to the growth and development of preservice teacher educators rather than to monitoring the basic competence of the teaching assistants who are employed by the teacher education department and, at the same time, which fits within the broad dictates of the university bylaws regarding the evaluation of all teaching assistants.

The Emergence of Preservice Teacher Education: A Pilot Evaluation Process

We began our pilot work by drafting a set of Preservice Teacher Educator Learning Goals and Targets[2] which outline a range of skills, knowledge-base, and competencies that are relevant

[2] For a full explication of our draft Preservice Teacher Educator "Learning Goals and Targets," please see: Adriance, L., & Jay, J. (2000). *Evaluating the work of preservice teacher educators: Considerations for supporting fairness and quality.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education; Chicago, IL.

to the craft of teaching and to the craft of leadership and scholarship. This document serves as the backdrop against which the evaluation process is entered into and negotiated between TEP TAs and their supervisors. At the center of this pilot evaluation process is an individual "Learning Target Contract," which is the document that initiates a year-long reflective dialogue between each TEP TA and their course professors, their colleagues, and their formal supervisor, the assistant director of the TEP program. This dialogue commences in quarterly goal-setting conferences between each individual TEP TA and the assistant director of the TEP program and Lead TA. While each TA is responsible for selecting a goal, i.e. learning target, towards which to direct their professional growth over the course of three quarters, the assistant director of the TEP program is responsible for coaching all TAs in taking steps towards their goals by providing resources and offering advice as to how to acquire the new skills and knowledge required in meeting ones' formal goals. Additionally, the assistant director of the TEP program is responsible for coaching inexperienced TAs towards become proficient in basic instructional skills.

Because TAs assist in the instruction of a TEP course each quarter, TAs are also responsible for sharing their selected professional goal with their professor and for entering into dialogue with them about what their needs and goals for their TA are. In each TAs' learning-goal contract, they record their self-selected professional goal, the goals articulated by their professor, and, for inexperienced TAs, the basic pedagogical goals underscored by the TEP TA supervisor. At the end of the quarter, all TAs are additionally responsible for documenting how they have progressed over the quarter in relation to their targeted goals through a written reflection. Synthesizing these written reflection statements, along with the course evaluation remarks of students, the written evaluation of TAs by course instructors, and the classroom-based observations of the assistant director of the TEP program, each quarter this TEP TA supervisor generates a formal evaluation for each TA which is then submitted to the permanent Graduate School files. A brief overview of this goal-setting and evaluation process is as follows:

1) Part One - - Goal Setting Phase

- Step One:

  Each individual TA selects a professional learning target.

- Step Two:

Each TA conferences with their course instructor, during which time they share their selected professional learning target, discuss what goals the professor has for them as the course instructional assistant and how the TAs' self-selected goals might be incorporated into their course responsibilities during the quarter, and generate strategies for achieving their mutual goals.

- Step Three:

  Each TA conferences with the Assistant Director of the TEP program and the Lead TA to discuss their selected professional learning targets/goals and to review the strategies which are being considered in achieving these goals. At this time, the TEP TA supervisor can direct TAs with no teaching experience to include "instructional strategies" as one of their formal learning targets.

2) Part Two - - Formal Evaluation Phase

- Step One:

  Student feedback is solicited on the effectiveness of each TA through the formal university course evaluation process.

- Step Two:

  TEP professors write up an evaluation of each TA regarding their contribution to the course for which they served as an instructional assistant.

- Step Three:

  Each TA reviews the learning targets that were selected at the beginning of the quarter. They document their growth in these targeted areas through a written reflection which is submitted with related artifacts as an entry in their preservice teacher educator professional portfolio.

- Step Four:

  The Assistant Director of the TEP program synthesizes her own observations with the feedback of all of the above parties through a formal written evaluation.

3) Part Three - - Re-assessment Phase

The process outlined above is repeated each quarter. The process is initiated when the TA

revisits and/or revises their professional learning targets, and engages anew in the dialogic, reflective conversation with course professors and their TEP supervisor.

Conclusion

In reflecting upon the response by TAs to this pilot goal-setting/evaluation process, the assistant director of the TEP program concludes:

"Putting TA preservice teacher educators in the drivers seat for the design and implementation of their own evaluation through a reflective portfolio process promoted a sense of professionalism and competence among TAs. It created a mutually supportive community of self-confident pre-service teacher educators who willingly brought the entire spectrum of their experience to the evaluation process with the knowledge that the goal was not judgment but improvement . . . Because of my efforts to insure the unfiltered inclusion of the TA's voice in the [formal] evaluation, even in the rare occurrence of a 'needs improvement' the evaluations have been viewed constructively by the TAs" (McKenna, 2000; p. 7).

While it might appear that the focal point of this goal-setting and evaluation process is the formal evaluation which the TEP TA supervisor submits each quarter, I contend that as this pilot program has gotten off the ground the real hub of this process has proven to be the learning-target contract and the reflective dialogue that is generated from the exchange surrounding the articulation of each TAs' professional goals. This reflective dialogue leads, in turn, to the production of the quarterly portfolio entries by each TA, which, in turn, stimulates further reflection and growth.

Equipped with the drafted Preservice Teacher Educator Goals and Targets, a desire to incorporate Portfolio into our evaluation process, and a commitment to putting reflection and professionalism at the center of all our practices, we seem to be on our way to transforming formal performance evaluation into an empowering rather than bureaucratic enterprise for the TEP TAs at the University of Washington. And in the process of putting TAs in the "drivers seat" of evaluation, we have created the possibility of coaching TEP TAs into becoming teacher educators who can simultaneously serve the TEP students, alongside the TEP faculty, and of growing into their own professional identities as scholars.

Works Cited

Adriance, L., & Jay, J. (2000). Evaluating the work of preservice teacher educators: Considerations for supporting fairness and quality. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Chicago, IL.

Duke, D. L. (1990). Developing teacher evaluation systems that promote professional growth. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 4, 131-144.

Gleave, D. (1997). Bifocals for teacher development and appraisal. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 12(3), 269-281.

McLaughlin, M.W., & Pfeifer, R.S. (1988). Teacher Evaluation: Improvement, Accountability, and Collective Learning. New York: Teachers College Press.

McKenna, H. (2000). Do as I do: Portfolio assessment and professional development among Preservice Teacher Educators. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Chicago, IL.

Natriello, G. (1984). Teachers' perceptions of the frequency of evaluation and assessments of their effort and effectiveness. American Educational Research Journal, 21(3), 579-595.

Peterson, P.L, & Comeaux, M.A. (1990). Evaluating the systems: Teachers' perspectives on teacher evaluation. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 12(1), 3-24.

The University of Washington. (1987). Executive Order No. 28. Available: http://www.grad.washington.edu:80//Acad/gsmemos/msmemo14.html.